

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/696,518	DAUDE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christian La Forgia	2131	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christian La Forgia. (3) _____.

(2) Matthew Baca (42,277). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 March 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent 5,884,024 and "Authentication for DHCP Messages".


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant alleged that the detecting an unauthorized dynamic host configuration server within an IP network in accordance with server identification data within the configuration offer message was not taught by Drom. The Examiner cited from page 4 that "the sender [server] inserts the authentication token in the DHCP message and the receiver matches the token from the message to the shared token" and "the server replies with a DHCPOFFER message that includes authentication information. This authentication information contains an encrypted value generated by the source [server] as a message authentication code to provide message authentication and entity authentication." Those two sections account for the server identification data. As for the motivation to combine Drom to Lim, the Examiner cited the section on page 2 that states motivation for establishing a "rogue server" would be to establish "man in the middle" attacks or DoS attacks and the motivation for an invalid client to masquerade as a valid client goes to theft of service. Thereby providing a motivation to seek out and terminate the existence of such rogue servers/clients.

DILLON & YUDELL LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Mr. Cristian LaForgia	Matthew W. Baca
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO	March 24, 2005
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
571-273-3792	3
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
RE:	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:
Agenda for phone conference	09/696,518

URGENT FOR REVIEW PLEASE COMMENT PLEASE REPLY PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

Examiner LaForgia,

Please find attached a proposed agenda for the phone conference tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, March 29 at 3:00 pm. Please contact me by email at baca@dillonyudell.com or phone at (512) 343-6116 if you need to re-schedule.

Thank you.

This fax from the law firm of Dillon & Yudell LLP contains information that is confidential or privileged, or both. This information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named on this fax cover letter. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information by any person other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this fax in error, please notify us by telephone immediately at 512.343.6116 so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the transmitted documents at no cost to you.

8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY., SUITE 2110, AUSTIN, TEXAS 78759
512.343.6116 (V) • 512.343.6446 (F) • DILLONYUDELL.COM

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:
OLIVIER DAUDE

Serial No.: 09/696,518

Filed: 10/25/2000

For: **M/S FOR PREVENTING
UNAUTHORIZED SERVER
INTERFERENCE IN AN
INTERNET PROTOCOL
NETWORK**

§ Attorney Docket No. **FR9-1999-0110**

§

§ Examiner: **CHRISTIAN A. LAFORGIA**

§

§ Art Unit: **2131**

§

REQUEST FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Applicants in the above-entitled U.S. Patent Application, by and through their attorney of record, respectfully request an interview with the Examiner to discuss this case. Applicants' attorney will be available for such telephone interview and will contact the Examiner on March 29, 2005, at 3:00 pm EST. The attorney's telephone number is: (512) 343-6116.

Agenda:


Applicants request a discussion of the rejection of the pending independent claims 1, 14, and 27 over U.S. Pat. Nos. 6,424,654 and 5,884,024, issued to *Daizo* and *Lim*, respectively, and in view of "Authentication of DHCP Messages" issued to *Droms*, and specifically relating to following items:

1. Relating to the recitation in Applicants' claim 1 of "detecting an unauthorized dynamic host configuration server within an IP network in accordance with server identification data within the configuration offer messages," *Droms*' teaching of a method for authenticating DHCP messages and the sources of DHCP messages does not appear to include authenticating a server using server identification data contained within configuration offer messages received by a checker client from DHC servers.

2. Whether or not *Lim* teaches unicasting host configuration requests from the sever checker client to the unauthorized dynamic configuration server in response to the foregoing "detecting" step.

3. Whether or not *Droms* (page 2) provides motivation to combine the "IP address hogging" problem cited by *Lim* as a remedial feature.

Respectfully submitted,


Matthew Baca, Reg. No. 42,277
Dillon & Yudell LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Highway, Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759 Tel.: 512.343.6116
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)